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This book is apparently intended as a “business getter” for claims before the two Mexican-United States claims commissions now about to begin their deliberations. The only parts of the book that seem to the reviewer calculated to aid the reader in the preparation of claims are the 33 pages reprinting, without quotations, the 1919 Circular of the Department of State. This can be obtained gratis from the Department. So can the rules (printed in an Appendix) adopted by the General Claims Commission (United States and Mexico) which is to sit in Washington.

After a “historical development” of four pages, which is a travesty on both words, comes a chapter of five pages on “status of alien,” a hodge-podge of paragraphs taken mostly from other books on the subject, without citation of authority or acknowledgment, and, by reason of its abbreviation, highly misleading. The inference (p. 7) that aliens internationally are entitled to the privileges and immunities mentioned in the first eight Amendments to the federal Constitution is erroneous. The following three chapters on “Presentation of Individual Claims” consist of certain declarations by the compiler, largely inadequate paraphrases of statements found in books by writers on the subject, followed by statements of the facts of claims cases supposed to be apposite. Many of them are not. They are practically all taken from Moore’s Arbitrations, but the source of authority is sometimes mentioned, sometimes not. Occasionally a manuscript citation is given, without the reference to Moore, from which the compiler in all probability got it. Quotations seem to be used or not as it struck the compiler’s fancy. The method of selecting the illustrative cases printed is not easily discernible; indeed, there seems to be none, for leading cases are hardly mentioned, whereas poorer cases, minority cases and overruled cases are introduced without apparent realization of their lack of importance (see, for example, the Antioquia case, pp. 47-48, long since overruled). The little that does serve to convey a coherent impression to the reader is so broad in its generalization or so fragmentary that it can be of little use, even to him who knows nothing about the subject.

Chapters VI and VII on “Claims Commissions” treat only three Commissions—the German-United States, now sitting, and the two prospective Mexican-United States (General and Special)—and are confined practically to the reprinting of Administrative Decision No. 1 of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, and of certain jurisdictional clauses from the treaties establishing the Mexican commissions. Moore’s Arbitrations (without citation) furnish the source for a few random cases from the Mexican Commission under the treaty of 1868. Under the head of “Issues” (70 pages) we find a practical reprint of the decisions of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany. Why this was done, it is not easy to say; the decisions are easily accessible, and they are hardly precedents in international claims cases, for the Treaty of Berlin imposed obligations which confessedly departed widely from the rules of international law. Then come 20 pages of further “Issues” on the liability of Mexico, quoted largely from the agreement negotiated by Ambassador Warren. A few facts concerning the chronology of change of governments in Mexico since 1910 are useful. Then comes a reprint of the decision on “principles” of the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission of 1901. The book ends up with a reprint of the Claims Circular of 1919.

Because the book deserves no further extension of this review, further details will be omitted. Its only saving grace is that the compiler claims little for it, though the publishers unjustifiably claim more. In so far as it does not quote verbatim readily accessible documents—which in fact constitute the bulk of the book—it consists of loose and fragmentary statements arranged in a rather haphazard fashion. There is practically nothing in the book, except the reprinted documents, that is of any material value to anybody. The book, from the public point of view, seems hardly to have justified publication.
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